

Attorney Docket No. OTD-030256 US
Customer No. 27778

REMARKS

Applicants note that in the Response to Arguments the Examiner observes with regard to the Wightman reference anticipates claim 1 and renders claim 12 obvious because despite the previously offered amendment to these claims, their language "only requires that the upper end of the mandrel not be rotated and does not require that no rotation take place at the point of connection. Secondly, it is noted that mandrel 19 of Wightman is still indirectly "connectable" to the drill string while not rotating when the tool is set."

Applicants have amended the language in claims 1 and 12 to try to respond to the issues raised by the Examiner in the quote above. The mandrel has an upper end connection to connect to the tubular string in claim 1 and the connection does not turn for a release between the tool body and the hanger. Thus claim 1 is directly addressing the Examiner's point that it is the connection at the top of the mandrel which is the point of direct support of the mandrel that does not turn to accomplish a release. This just is not possible in Wightman. He has to start things off by breaking pin 23 with rotation of the drill pipe connected at the upper end connection 15. Claim 1 requires the upper end connection to the tubular string not to turn. The practical difficulty the Applicants seem to have is that they don't intend to claim the supporting string itself. Rather, they desire to achieve the same purpose as saying the string needs no rotation by saying that the connection to the string at the mandrel doesn't turn. It is now submitted that that is exactly what claim 1 says and that it is clearly not anticipated by Wightman. In Wightman the barrel 13 is connected to the housing 19 through pin 23. Nothing happens without rotation of barrel 13 to break pin 23. Barrel 13 has the upper end connection and must be considered by the Examiner as part of the mandrel assembly when connected to housing 19. Indeed, the Examiner's argument plays into Applicants rationale that the new claims are not in conflict with the original claims because a mandrel assembly can have multiple parts.


As to claim 12 it is allowable for the same reason as just applied to claim 1.

Claims 19 and 26 have been clarified that there is a mandrel assembly that has more

Attorney Docket No. OTD-030256 US
Customer No. 27778

than one part. In view of that amendment those claims are not inconsistent with the original claims or the specification. Note that dependent claims 22 and 27 recite that the mandrel assembly has a mandrel and a tool body, specifically. Thus the independent claims broadly recite the invention in terms that are consistent with the way it has been claimed before. The difference, which it appears the Examiner appreciates, is that claims 19 and 26 have been stripped of unnecessary limitations in claim 1 that unduly narrow that claim. The newly added claims aim to capture the full scope of the invention and still include elements that are in claim 1 but leave off others. What is still there and distinguishes over Wightman is the feature argued for allowance of claim 1. It is submitted that these new claims raise no new issue and require no further search and should be allowed over Wightman.

Respectfully submitted,



Manish B. Vyas
Registration No.: 54,516
Cooper Cameron Corporation
P.O. Box 1212
Houston, Texas 77251-1212
Phone: 713 939 2343
Fax: 713 939 2856